

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
CIVIL MINUTES—  
GENERAL

Case No. 5:23-cv-01498-SHK

Date August 14, 2023

Title *Raul Uriarte-Limon v. Ontario Pharmacy, Inc. et al*

Present: The Honorable

SHASHI H. KEWALRAMANI, UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE  
JUDGE

Danalyn Cisneros

Not Reported

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s):

Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s):

None Present

None Present

**Proceedings: ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE COURT SHOULD NOT  
DENY SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION**

The complaint filed in this action asserts a claim for injunctive relief arising out of an alleged violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) and a claim for damages pursuant to California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”). See “Complaint,” Electronic Case Filing Number 1. It appears that the Court possesses only supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim, and any other state-law claim that Plaintiff may have alleged, pursuant to the Court’s supplemental jurisdiction. See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

The supplemental jurisdiction statute “reflects the understanding that, when deciding whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction, ‘a federal court should consider and weigh in each case, and at every stage of the litigation, the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity.’” City of Chicago v. Int’l Coll. of Surgeons, 522 U.S. 156, 173 (1997) (quoting Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)). Therefore, the Court orders Plaintiff to show cause in writing why the Court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and any other state-law claim asserted in the complaint. See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).

In responding to this Order to Show Cause (“OSC”), Plaintiff shall identify the amount of statutory damages that Plaintiff seeks to recover. Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s Counsel shall also support their responses to the OSC with declarations, signed under penalty of perjury, providing all facts necessary for the Court to determine if they satisfy the definition of a “high-frequency

litigant” as provided by California Civil Procedure Code Sections 425.55(b)(1)-(b)(2). Plaintiff shall file a Response to this OSC no later than August 29, 2023.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**